WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITIES POLICY STAKEHOLDERS REVIEW COMMITTEE – MINUTES

February 24, 2010 – 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Development Services Center/City Operations Building 4th Floor Training Room 1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101

Committee Members:

X	Bill D'Agostino		Charles Mellor
X	Carolyn Balkwell	X	Joe Parker, Alternate
X	Craig Benedetto	X	Brooke Peterson
X	Robert Coffin		Patrick Shipley
X	Leslie Daigle	X	Ed Smith, Jr.
X	Darrell W. Daugherty	X	Jany Staley
X	Jon Dohm	X	Joe Thompson
X	Kevin Gregory		Jason Wells
X	Joe LaCava, Chair	X	Frisco White, Vice-Chair
X	Kelly Lemker		

City Staff Members:

- ☑ Cecilia Gallardo, Development Services
- ☑ Alex Hempton, Development Services
- ⊠ Karen Lynch-Ashcraft, Development Services
- ☐ Michael Neumeyer, City Attorney's Office

CALL TO ORDER @ 8:08 a.m.

Joe LaCava called the meeting to order

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes for January 27, 2010 and February 24, 2010 will be presented for approval at the March 10, 2010 meeting

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

<u>Cynthia Conger</u> – Spoke of Conflict-of-Interest concern regarding a Committee member being an Industry consultant representing the Peninsula Community.

Cecilia Gallardo advised that issues related to Conflict of Interest with Planning Board members and subcommittees should be directed to City Planning and Community Investment.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Joe Parker provided the committee with a map and list of Legacy sites that are expired or soon-to-expire.

WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITIES POLICY STAKEHOLDERS REVIEW COMMITTEE – February 24, 2010 MINUTES Page 2

INFORMATION ITEMS

ITEM 1 – Community Issues and Concerns, Brooke Peterson & Kelly Lemker: A presentation will be made by committee members on Community issues and concerns regarding existing, proposed, and future wireless communication facilities and the ways in which the City's current Ordinance, policies, and guidelines do not serve the needs of communities.

Brooke Peterson introduced joint presentation given by herself, Kelly Lemker and Bob Coffin explaining that their interest is in the right facilities, in the right location, and the right design.

The presentation included the following topics:

- Points of Agreement
 - o Telecommunications facilities are a critical component of our infrastructure.
 - o There are limitations in current ordinance.
 - o Need predictable, consistent, and comprehensive application of regulations.
 - o Need to resolve the legacy site renewal issue.
- Community Issues
 - Inadequate regulations to govern installation, expansion, and enforcement of WCFs.
 - o Inconsistency in the application of regulations across communities.
 - o Inadequate consideration and compromise on alternatives.
 - o Inadequate standards.
 - o Inadequate compliance and enforcement.

Further explanation examined issues related to enforcement, location, need for adequate regulations, fairness in applicability of regulations, alternative sites, education, justification and lack of enforcement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Reynaldo Pisano – Brought photo of questionable antenna site.

Cynthia Conger – Discussion of Peninsula area issues.

Cynthia Morgan – Opposed to Verizon Kate Sessions 5 projects within La Jolla.

WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITIES POLICY STAKEHOLDERS REVIEW COMMITTEE – February 24, 2010 MINUTES Page 3

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- Bob Coffin identified current case law and enforcement issues.
- Add Palos Verdes case law to new regulations
- Karen Lynch-Ashcraft explained potential changes in city property process
- Joe Parker clarified why Crown Castle pole is still up and operating due to litigation
- Consultants unable and unwilling (at times) to provide information
- Staff needs to respond to community presentation and misinformation
- Information provided to Community Planning Group's is inadequate.
- Require DAS in all residential areas or underground
- Provide database of all DAS sites
- Provide 1-800 number for all DAS/ROW sites for cross-referencing to database to provide information
- Noticing requirements
- Expanding noticing boundaries
- 100' noticing boundary to be increased
- Application "deemed complete" process is confusing.
- Provide RF information at time of application
- Permit deemed complete is different from CEQA "deemed complete"
- Revise DAS in all residential areas or underground
- Need cooperative effort between Community Planning Groups and Park Advisory Board
- Community Planning Groups want early input
- Long term landscape maintenance is an issue, when required for screening facilities
- 3rd party reviews of technical studies

ACTION ITEMS

None

CLOSING COMMENTS – <u>Joe LaCava</u>

- More DSD training for community planning group members may be necessary
- Uniformity/Predictability in regulations, ordinance and policy
- **Establish Standards with customization abilities within each community**
- Our next steps would be, what can we do to make it better?

Next Meeting: March 10, 2010 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.- Presentation and discussion of City staff issues and concerns